

REMARKS

Status of Claims

Claims 1-5 and 20-26 are pending and claims. Reconsideration of the rejections of claims 1-5 and 20-26 is earnestly solicited in view of the following remarks.

Rejection of claims 1-5 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-5 and 22 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 5,946,499 to Saunders (hereinafter “Saunders”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,466,240 to Maslov (hereinafter “Maslov”) and U.S. Patent No. 5,109,439 to Froessl (hereinafter “Froessl”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The prior art, including Saunders, Maslov and Froessl fail to teach or suggest, among other things “attaching a property to the document in at least one position in the document, wherein the property preserves originally entered data.”

Saunders discloses a text services manager that controls interactions between text services and an application. See U.S. Patent No. 5,946,499 (issued Aug. 31, 1999) col. 3, ll.20-35. The text services filter input device events that are passed to the application. *Id. at 36-42*. The text services perform functions and interact with the user on behalf of the application. *Id.* The application interact with the text services through a TSMDocument data structure, which includes the TSMContext, a locale object and a SOM object. *Id. at col. 4, ll. 20-30*. The TSM document is destroyed when the text service operations are complete. *Id. at col. 4, ll. 20-27*. The TSMContext enables a text service to reserve a portion of the document utilizing a unique identifier, a owner and range. The TSMcontext allows the service to manipulate the specified region. *Id. at col. 7, ll. 1-30*.

Maslov disclose a method to build or transform programs or scripts using a graphical user interface. U.S. Patent No. 6,466,240 (issued Oct. 15, 2002) col. 1, ll.1-15. Maslov further discloses structured text is changed by manipulating a visual tree representation using graphical commands such as, copy and paste. *Id. at col. 2, ll. 40-45*. The tree is displayed in a first window that is synchronized with a second window displaying the structured text corresponding to the tree: if a tree node is selected by a user

in the first window, the fragment of the structure text in the second window is highlighted. *Id. at col. 3, ll. 35-45.*

Froessl discloses a storage and retrieval system that scans words and relates them to scanned documents. U.S. Patent No. 5,109,439 (issued Apr. 28, 1992) col. 1, ll.5-10. The documents are scanned and converted to code (Ascii) and an image of the document is stored in volatile memory. *Id. at col. 7, ll. 55-65.* The system then flags a identification number associated with the document if a conversion problem occurs. *Id. at col. 8, ll. 1-10.* Furthermore, Froessl disclose storing the image and full text conversion. *Id. at col. 8, ll. 24-30.*

With respect to claim 1, the Office Action attempts to reconstruct the claimed invention from the disclosures of Saunders, Maslov and Froessl. Each reference is directed to a different field of endeavor and attempts to solve a different problem. The Office action presents a piecemeal analysis of the claimed invention and fails to teach or suggest all claimed limitations of the invention.

The Office Action construes the unique identifier disclosed by Saunders to be a property that is modifiable to preserve the original raw data. This modification however would be in operable because Saunders, in col. 4, ll. 10-30, discloses that the TSM document data structure which includes the reference to the range is destroyed. Accordingly, the original raw data can not be preserved and the Saunders reference can not be modified by Froessl without destroying the disclosed operations of the Saunders reference.

Unlike the prior art, Saunders, Maslov and Froessl, embodiments of the invention preserves the original raw data by utilizing a range object to attach the original raw data to the specified range in the document. Furthermore, the text services, provide text input and not original raw input to the application.

Moreover, the references Saunders, Maslov and Froessl fail to suggest or provide a motivation for combining the references. Furthermore, the references teach away from the claimed invention because Froessl fails to provide attaching the original raw data at the range specified by a range object. Accordingly, claim 1 is allowable over the prior art, and the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) of claim 1 should withdrawn.

Claims 2-5 depend on claim 1 and further defines novel features of the claimed invention. Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1, claims 2-5 are allowable over the prior art.

Claim 22 depends on claim 20 which is addressed below. The Office Action has grouped this claim as a dependent claim when addressing claim 1 and addressed the limitations of claim 22 before addressing the limitations of the parent claim, claim 20. This claim will be discussed below when discussing claim 20.

Rejection of claims 20, 21 and 23-26 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 20, 21 and 23-26 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Saunders in view of Froessl. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The prior art, including Saunders, Maslov and Froessl fail to teach or suggest, among other things “attaching a property in the document at range specified in the range object, the property providing access to original raw data.”

With respect to claims 20 and 23, the Office Action construes the unique identifier disclosed by Saunders to be a property that is modifiable to preserve the original raw data. This modification however would be inoperable because Saunders in col 4, ll. 10-30 discloses that the TSM document data structure which includes the reference to the range is destroyed. Moreover, the unique identifier is a 32-bit number not related to original raw data. Accordingly, the original raw data can not be preserved and the Saunders reference can not be modified by Froessl without destroying the disclosed operation of the Saunders reference.

Unlike the prior art, Saunders, Maslov and Froessl, embodiments of the invention preserve the original raw data by utilizing a range object to attach the original raw data to that specified range in the document. Furthermore, the text services, provide text input and not original raw input to the application.

Moreover, the references Saunders, Maslov and Froessl fail to suggest or provide a motivation for combining the references, and the references teach away from the claimed invention because Froessl fails to provide attaching the original raw data at the range specified by a range object by utilizing a property. Accordingly, claims 20 and 23

are allowable over the prior art, and the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) of claims 20 and 23 should withdrawn.

Claims 21-22 and 24-26 depend on claim 20 and 23 and further defines novel features of the claimed invention. Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 20 and 23, claims 21-22 are allowable over the prior art.

CONCLUSION

As set forth above, applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request that this application be allowed and passed to issue. Should, however, any issues remain prior to issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned to resolve the same. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional amount required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-2112 referencing Attorney Docket No. MFCP.87507.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 27, 2005



Monplaisir Hamilton
Reg. No. 54,851

SHOOK, HARDY & BACON L.L.P.
2555 Grand Boulevard
Kansas City, Missouri 64108
Phone: (816) 474-6550
Facsimile (816) 421-5547